



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,353	03/09/2001	Mary A. Metelko	TI-30802	7441
23494 7590 11/03/2008 TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265				
EXAMINER				
REFAI, RAMSEY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3627				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/03/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/802,353

Applicant(s)

METELKO ET AL.

Examiner

Ramsey Refai

Art Unit

3627

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) received October 15, 2008. Claim 12 has been amended. Claims 1-24 remain presented.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues with substance:

Argument A: *Nadan does not disclose an access device that wirelessly accesses content comprising HTML command from a server via the Internet and then locally wirelessly transmits that content to the projection system.*

The Applicant is arguing that MAC 34 which accesses network elements is in the projection system 10 **and not in the PDA**. However, it is urged that MAC 34 acts as an intermediate device which **enables connection of any conferee using PDAs to access content on the Internet**. Therefore, the PDAs are accessing the Internet **via** MAC 34 and therefore meet the scope of the claimed limitation of an access device that wirelessly accesses content comprising HTML command from a server via the Internet.

Regarding the transmission of content consisting of HTML commands to a projection system, the Examiner has relied upon Lee to teach this limitation. Naden teaches that the PDA can wirelessly access the internet (**column 4, line 60-67**) and graphics data, which can include compressed and uncompressed transmissions of graphics, motion graphics and video graphics (**column 2, line 33-36**) but fails to explicitly teach that the data transferred to the projection system is HTML commands. However, in the same field of endeavor, **Lee** teaches an LCD projector that receives Internet image signals from a user PC and then displays the image

(**column 3, lines 48-54**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Naden and Lee because doing so would allow for Internet content viewed on the PDA to be sent to the projector for display.

Naden teaches that the PDAs can access the Internet via MAC 34, which enables connection of any conferee to the Internet via wired or wireless connections (**see column 4, line 60-column 5, line 2**). Regarding the transmission of content consisting of HTML commands to a projection system, the Examiner has relied upon Lee to teach this limitation. Naden teaches that the PDA can wirelessly access the internet (**column 4, line 60-67**) and graphics data, which can include compressed and uncompressed transmissions of graphics, motion graphics and video graphics (**column 2, line 33-36**) but fails to explicitly teach that the data transferred to the projection system is HTML commands. However, in the same field of endeavor, **Lee** teaches an LCD projector that receives Internet image signals from a user PC and then displays the image (**column 3, lines 48-54**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Naden and Lee because doing so would allow for Internet content viewed on the PDA to be sent to the projector for display.

Argument B: *No motivation to combine Naden and Lee.*

It is noted that **KSR** forecloses the argument that a **specific** teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. Under **KSR**, a claim would have been obvious if the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than **predictable results** to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Furthermore, under **KSR**, a claim would have been obvious if a particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary

capabilities of one skilled in the art. Thus the claimed subject matter likely would have been obvious under **KSR**. Naden teaches that the PDA can wirelessly access the internet (**column 4, line 60-67**) and graphics data, which can include compressed and uncompressed transmissions of graphics, motion graphics and video graphics (**column 2, line 33-36**) but fails to explicitly teach that the data transferred to the projection system is HTML commands. However, in the same field of endeavor, **Lee** teaches an LCD projector that receives Internet image signals from a user PC and then displays the image (**column 3, lines 48-54**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Naden and Lee because doing so would allow for Internet content viewed on the PDA to be sent to the projector for display.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 10-13, 15-16, 18, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naden (US Patent No. 7,057,635) in view of Lee (US Patent No. 6,337,769).

4. As per claim 1, Naden teaches a display system for displaying internet content, comprising:

an access device (**column 3, line 37, Fig 1; PDA**) having a display unit (**column 3, lines 58-61; local display**) and operable to wirelessly access content comprising HTML

commands from a serve via the Internet and wirelessly transmit the content (**column 4, lines 60-67; PDAs access the internet wirelessly**); and

a display device (**fig 1; projection system 10**) comprising:

a radio frequency receiver (**fig 1; transceiver 8**) operable to graphics data from the access device (**column 3, lines 39-41, column 2, lines 37-45; access device transfers graphical data for display to the projection system**) ;

a processor programmed to interpret graphics data and to generate pixel data, based on the graphics data; and a display engine operable to receive the pixel data (**column 4, lines 1-15, column 1, lines 11-25; projector generates display of the received data**).

Naden teaches that the PDA can wirelessly access the internet (**column 4, line 60-67**) and graphics data, which can include compressed and uncompressed transmissions of graphics, motion graphics and video graphics (**column 2, line 33-36**) but fails to *explicitly* teach that the data transferred to the projection system is *HTML commands*. However, in the same field of endeavor, Lee teaches an LCD projector that receives Internet image signals from a user PC and then displays the image (**column 3, lines 48-54**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Naden and Lee because doing so would allow for Internet content viewed on the PDA to be sent to the projector for display.

5. As per claim 2, Naden teaches the receiver is further operable to receive data files associated with the HTML commands (**column 2, lines 33-36**).

6. As per claim 3, Naden teaches data files are compressed data files (**column 2, lines 33-36**) and wherein the display device further comprises: a frame buffer and a digital signal processor for receiving the compressed data files from the processor, decompressing the data files, and

passing the decompressed data to the frame buffer (**column 4, lines 1-16; frame buffers are inherent in projectors/displays**).

7. As per claim 5, 11, 18 and 23, Naden teaches a display device wherein the receiver operates in accordance with Bluetooth specifications or wherein the receiver operates in accordance with specifications (**column 2, line 5; Bluetooth**).

8. As per claim 10, Naden teaches wherein the processor is an embedded processor (**column 4, lines 1-16; projection system inherently contains a processor**)

9. As per claim 12, it contains similar features as claim 1, therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

10. As per claim 13, Naden teaches receiving data files associated with the HTML commands from the server, by means of the wireless receiver (**column 4, lines 60-67; PDAs communicate with the Internet wirelessly**). Naden teaches that the PDA can wirelessly access the internet (**column 4, line 60-67**) and graphics data, which can include compressed and uncompressed transmissions of graphics, motion graphics and video graphics (**column 2, line 33-36**) but fails to *explicitly* teach that the data transferred to the projection system is *HTML commands*. However, in the same field of endeavor, Lee teaches an LCD projector that receives Internet image signals from a user PC and then displays the image (**column 3, lines 48-54**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Naden and Lee because doing so would allow for Internet content viewed on the PDA to be sent to the projector for display.

11. As per claim 14, Naden teaches the data files are compressed data files (**column 2, lines 33-36**), and further comprising the step of decompressing the data files, using a processor embedded in the display device (**column 4, lines 1-16**).

12. As per claim 15, Naden teaches the decompressing step is performed using an embedded digital signal processor in communication with the microprocessor (**column 4, lines 1-16; projection system inherently contains a processor**).

13. As per claim 16, Naden teaches the step of receiving display operation data, by means of the wireless receiver, and of interpreting the display operation data (**column 4, lines 42-59; users can control display**).

14. As per claim 22, Naden teaches wherein the receiving steps are performed by receiving the HTML commands and display operation data from a mobile Internet access device (**column 4, lines 40-59, column 2, lines 33-36, PDA sends graphics data for display and control operations to control display**) .

15. As per claim 24, Naden teaches wherein the generating step is performed using a graphics rendering process (**column 4, lines 1-16**).

16. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naden in view of Lee and further view of Lemilainen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,681,259).

17. As per claim 6 and 19, Naden fails to *explicitly* teach a device wherein the receiver operates in accordance with IEEE specifications.

18. However, Lemilainen show a device that uses IEEE 802.11 standard for data transmission (column 7, line 55-67). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Naden and Lemilainen to create a display device with a receiver that operates in accordance with IEEE specifications because doing so would provide greater flexibility by allowing different types of devices that use different techniques to communicate with the display device.

19. Claims 7 –9, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naden in view Lee and in further view of MacAulay et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,663,560).

20. As per claim 7, 8 and 20-21, Naden fails to teach a display device wherein the display engine has a spatial light modulator for rendering displays and wherein the spatial light modulator is a digital micromirror device.

21. However, MacAulay show viewing devices that comprise a spatial light modulator, which can be a digital micromirror device (abstract and column 8, lines 10-40). It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings Naden and MacAulay to create a display device with a digital micromirror device because doing so would allow images to be displayed brighter, sharper, and more realistic.

22. As per claim 9, Naden teaches wherein the receiver is part of a two way RF transceiver (column 4, lines 17-32).

23. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naden in view of Lee and in further view of "Official Notice".

24. As per claims 4 and 17, Naden fails to explicitly teach the use of XML data.

25. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of using XML language is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to use XML language because it would offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information than is possible with the other markup languages, such as HTML. **No challenge as provided by MPEP sec. 2144.03c was advanced, and hence is made final.**

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: The Examiner has cited specific citations in the reference(s) as applied to the claim(s) above for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the Applicant, in preparing their response, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Furthermore, claims directed to an apparatus **must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function**. In re Danly, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd Pat. App & Inter. 1987). Thus, as described above, the functional limitations in claims 1-11 do not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramsey Refai
October 27, 2008
/Ramsey Refai/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627